

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 have been pending in the application.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barbara Hayes-Roth et al. (U.S. 2002-0005865 A1).

The claims are amended, and, thus, pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter has been added.

An interview with the Examiner is requested to expedite prosecution.

The independent claims are 1, 15 and 16. The Office Action Response to Arguments relies upon Barbara Hayes-Roth paragraph 43 and maintains that 'The Agent in Barbara Hayes-Roth is the applicant's dialog control part and that the plurality of agents are the 'actual context of an agent matches a given potential context of the agent if a value of a state variable in the given actual context matches a value of a corresponding state variable in the given potential context'.' The Response to Arguments also refers to the present published specification paragraphs 14 and 19, which generally discuss a plurality of dialog agents 304 in relation to the dialog control part 303 and broadcasting capabilities of the plurality of dialog agents by registration at the dialog control part 303. Claim 1 is amended for clarity.

Claim 1 is amended to require the limitation "a dialog agent control part that communicates with the dialog agents and the input part, and which intermediates between the plurality of dialog agents and the input part, **registers processing capability information indicating input information which each dialog agent is capable of accepting in each state**~~about each of the plurality of the dialog agents~~ by requesting the processing capability information from one or more of the dialog agents ... wherein, **each dialog agent notifies the dialog agent control part of the processing capability information of the dialog agent according to the state of the dialog agent** and ... **the dialog control part selects a dialog agent based upon the registered processing capability information of each dialog agent in each state**" (emphasis added). Therefore, a prima facie case of anticipation based upon Hayes-Roth cannot be established, because nothing has been found in Hayes-Roth that discusses either expressly or inherently the above-discussed feature as recited by the language of amended claim 1. In other words, Hayes-Roth paragraph 43 discusses an agent determining whether an actual state variable in the given actual context matches a corresponding state variable in the given potential context, but fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently (by

failing to necessarily require), that each of a plurality of dialog agents notify a dialog agent controller, as an intermediary of the plurality of dialog agents, of each dialog agent's processing capability in relation to the state of each dialog agent, namely the claimed "**each dialog agent notifies the dialog agent control part of the processing capability information of the dialog agent according to the state of the dialog agent**" and the dialog agent control part "**registers processing capability information indicating input information which each dialog agent is capable of accepting in each state**" about each of the plurality of the dialog agents by requesting the processing capability information from one or more of the dialog agents" (emphasis added). Similarly, Hayes-Roth paragraph 78 fails to disclose either expressly or inherently the language of claim 1. For example, the present application page 3, lines 7-12; page 4, lines 13-20; and page 19, line 8 to page 21, line 25, support the claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Independent claims 15 and 16 are amended to require limitations similar to the discussed limitations of claim 1. The remaining dependent claims inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____ April 7, 2009 _____

By: _____
Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501